

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 10. No. 13.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper
Postage (home and abroad) 1d.

SATURDAY, JUNE 5, 1943.

6d. Weekly.

The late William Aberhart

On Monday morning, May 24, 1943, I received a cablegram despatched on Sunday, May 23, from Edmonton, Alberta, reading: "Premier Aberhart died this morning in Vancouver Hospital after brief illness."

On the same Monday morning the better-class British newspapers (all things are relative) published colourless but in the main accurate and inoffensive obituary notices. The others published news items reporting his death with that sense of good taste and consideration for the public interest which their general character appears to render inevitable.

But the Press in general made no technical mistake. A great man had died, and that was front-page news.

William Aberhart was born on December 30, 1878, in Huron County, Ontario, and was thus 64 years of age— not unduly old as Prime Ministers and Premiers go. While, no doubt, the strain of the past few years has been heavy, he was healthy and of strong physique. He was a graduate of Queen's University, Toronto, and went West to Alberta shortly after taking a B.A. degree.

He was until 1935 head master of Crescent Heights School, Calgary. His career subsequent to his entry into politics in 1935 is well known, and need not be recapitulated here. The character of the man, and the nature of his historic and successful fight against the massed forces of Finance and corrupt politics are not so well known and have, of course, been misrepresented to meet the convenience of his reporters and critics.

To understand his problem, it is first necessary to realise that Canadian politics, even Federal politics at Ottawa, give to anyone familiar with Westminster a curious impression of immaturity. But the Social Credit members of Mr. Aberhart's Government when it was first elected in 1935 were good honest farmers with about as much knowledge of affairs as they had of Greek particles.

They were pitted, and Mr. Aberhart was pitted, not against his Legislative Opposition alone, because that only consisted of six, although these six were the only experienced politicians in the Legislature, but against the Central Banks of the world whose controllers hastened to establish the local branch, the Bank of Canada, in Ottawa, and to install Mr. Montagu Norman's nominee, Mr. Graham Towers, as Governor.

Exceptional as the new Premier was in electioneering ability, I do not believe that either he or his supporters had the slightest conception of the distance which separated them from the knowledge which was indispensable to even a

fighting chance against an enemy with the experience of the ages to help him. The miraculous fact is that they escaped disaster, if even only by a hair's breadth. They could not fail to make mistakes, but they learnt by them.

It is not easy for a man of 57, the greater part of whose life has been spent in teaching, to learn. It was here that one of Aberhart's outstanding qualities shone so clearly. He was, beyond all question, a man of complete integrity, more concerned to fulfil his pledges than to force his own ideas, once he was convinced that they were wrong or inexpedient. In the short space of five years, while drastically remodelling and purifying the day-to-day administration of the Province, he uncovered his enemies' hand by a series of Bills which forced Mr. Mackenzie King, returned to power at Ottawa on a speech demanding "Hands off Alberta," to forswear himself by disallowing them.

This is not the time or place to recapitulate the steady growth in Canadian esteem both of the Aberhart Government and the ideas for which he fought so well. The details of the policy pursued have been admirably recorded in the Reports of the Social Credit Board. A recent Gallup Poll recorded a doubling of support for Social Credit ideas over Canada as a whole, and this, for reasons of language, takes no account of the formidable body of adherents in the Province of Quebec.

Whether it was humanly possible for a man of his age and localised experience to have succeeded in the more complex problems of the Federal Government is hard to say, but there is little doubt that he was beginning to appear as a coming Prime Minister of Canada.

Now he cannot fail, as his Cause cannot fail. "His sword is for him who can use it... and the Trumpets sounded for him on the other side."

C. H. D.

Schemes That Planners Plot

By R. L. DUCLOS,

President, The Douglas Social Credit Bureau of Canada, Inc.

We are being lulled into complacency with honied words about security and freedom while we are being lured into the dread net of bondage by subtle schemes popularised by clever propaganda.

In times of crisis when people are easily panicked; when distress from war and destruction renders them easy prey to charlatans, it is well to get our bearing by contemplating words of wisdom: "Beware of false prophets"—"Ye

shall know them by their fruits."

Would-be leaders are springing up from every direction advocating all manner of schemes to further enslave the unwary; men who, if silence gives consent, were thoroughly satisfied with the wretched conditions of the hungry thirties, are now showing great activity in planning the future of those they so recently ignored. . . .

The bureaucratic "planner" does not view the supply problem with the idea of ascertaining how *much* we can supply but on how *little* we can survive. Scarcity is an obsession with him, as with Sir William Beveridge, who drew up his report on the basis of providing the irreducible minimum standard for physical existence—rather than the absolute maximum standard of wellbeing possible.

In the report itself, Sir William uses the words "minimum subsistence" and "bare necessities of existence" and states that weekly food allowances "may reasonably be divided as seven shillings for a single man, and six shillings for a single woman." Further he states that such lavishness need not be extended to elderly people, however, "because of their failing mastication and digestion," and therefore their allowances are cut to "for a man six shillings a week and for a woman, five shillings and sixpence a week." This plan, to quote Sir William, is designed to bring the British people "half way to Russia." Can this be true, or is it merely a cunning device of Sir William to popularise his "planned poverty" on the current wave of admiration for the brave and fearless Russian people?

This is the same concept as that of the international banker, who during the depression told the people of the fabulously rich Australia that if they didn't accept certain financial terms, that would impoverish half their population, they could "stew in their own juice"—and they stewed. The same banker is likely still busy "planning" and in all probability, placing dollars before souls.

. . . In a speech before the Fabian Society in London on November 21, 1942, Sir William advocated a new type of Freedom: "Freedom from Idleness" and that in his opinion "Freedom from idleness is more important than freedom from want."

These planners are progressing rapidly. At first it was "work or starve" but now it is "work, whether or not you starve." Seemingly they have never heard the story of the Irishman who tried to get his horse to go without food but just when he thought he had it trained, the horse dropped dead. Surely they know, if they have the wit to see what happens in war-time, that we have the production necessary to supply everybody with enough and to spare, but they begrudge the money, the figures in books, to make it possible. Once more man is to be crucified on the dollar sign.

These men pose as democrats as they build Hitlerism—for what difference is there between the near-starvation peonage of the Beveridge work state; or the type of existence apparently favoured by Montagu Norman, "Poverty is good for you"—for "you" not for Norman: the "stew in your own juice" type of Australia favoured by Sir Otto Niemeyer; or the Nazi Germany advocated by Richard Walther Darre, former Nazi minister of agriculture, when he stated "We actually have in mind a modern form of medieval slavery which we must and will introduce. . . ."

By way of contrast consider the utterances of Henry

Wallace, Vice-President, U.S.A., who states: "This is a fight between a slave world and a free world." And further, "Men and women cannot be really free until they have plenty to eat and time and ability to read and think and talk things over."

Here is a glorious ray of light from the new dawn—freedom, abundance and leisure. Against that is the planned poverty of the schemers with their compulsory insurance doles; compulsory work schemes; compulsory regimentation.

The issue is clear—it is the same issue that has been with us for centuries but it has climaxed in the last twenty-five years. It is the issue of Christ as against anti-Christ; of freedom *versus* slavery; of democracy *versus* totalitarianism; of abundance *versus* scarcity; of leisure *versus* the work state; of the people *versus* money power; the constructive liberating forces of God against the destructive enslaving powers of evil.

We all must choose the side we take, for we're in this battle whether or no. All the would-be Hitlers are not in Germany, so in choosing we should first be sure to understand the issue clearly. The charlatans ever give lip service to high ideals. "We are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands," to quote Professor Arnold Toynbee, of the Royal Institute of International Affairs.

This planning of your life and mine may be all very pleasant (and profitable) for the planners but what about the planned—the people? If these plans are put into force and we don't like them, what then? Who will control the planners? Hitler and Mussolini started off as pink parlour Socialists, but planning requires power and "power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely" to quote the wise Lord Acton. The real problem seems to be to devise some plan for planning the schemers.

Why not solve the post-war problems by sane methods? As stated by Major C. H. Douglas, "The ideology begins very simply. We have to discard the idea that every child is born into the world to mind someone else's business, and substitute the fact that he is responsible for minding his own. That he should help, not meddle."

This planning business is an obsession, a disease, and those affected—the planners—those who suffer from the hallucinations from the planned economy virus—would turn us all into guinea pigs. They'd willingly put us into test tubes to experiment with us in the hope that they could thereby bring into being their special brand of regimented utopia.

Not all the planners are that extreme. Most of them are well meaning, idealistic, seemingly harmless sort of individuals who have been only slightly touched, but the virus is there and it will grow. As with creeping paralysis, once an organism has been afflicted the whole is in danger. They get to believe in restrictions and regimentations for their own sake. They would start by rationing sugar and butter and likely end by rationing water. Not because there is no water but because they have a nice "plan." They would sooner ration the water than turn on the pumps.

They believe in scarcity not because there is a lack but because "it's good for you." They believe in "sacrifice" not because sacrifice in itself helps win the war but because "sacrificing" sounds patriotic and anyway it's part and parcel of "planning" together with "scarcity," "regimentation" and eventually "snooping." The planning type of

mind just naturally trains you to make it your business to mind other people's—as against a normal reaction of making it your business to mind your own.

If in war time our industry can turn out millions of small arms, thousands of tanks and planes, hundreds of ships and build dozens of new towns, together with all the rest of the war production, and do all this with half of our workers in the armed forces and government services—then let no one tell you that we in peace time and with all our workers available couldn't produce hundreds of thousands of new homes, thousands of miles of new roads, millions of cars, radios, and other devices for our comfort and happiness.

If in war time we can use all this production in defence of democracy and freedom, then in peace time we can use it to make this same democracy and freedom a reality.

This we can do without any stereotyped schemes hatched from the virile minds and sterile hearts of those who would enslave us by subtle plots designed to prevent mankind from entering the age of abundance, freedom, leisure, culture and happiness.

Condensed from THE OTTAWA EVENING CITIZEN.

I . C . I .

The following were among the points made by Lord McGowan in his remarks from the chair at the sixteenth ordinary general meeting of Imperial Chemical Industries Limited on May 27:—

“The numbers of both workers and staff in the company's employment, in which I include those in the agency factories which we manage for the Government, again show substantial increases during 1942....”

“From the early days of the war the Government has drawn heavily on our executive and senior staff to fill administrative and technical posts of great importance; many of our leading technicians and scientists have also been seconded for service with the United States, Canada, Australia, and Africa to assist in their war production; specialists from I.C.I. have also been called upon to carry out missions to Russia, China, Central Asia, Malta, and elsewhere. In all, 2,500 of our staff, foremen and technicians have been placed at the disposal of Britain and the Allied Nations for these purposes....”

“We again present to you the legal accounts with a consolidated balance-sheet and a consolidated income account for the year. The consolidated accounts show the combined assets and liabilities at December 31, 1942, and the combined income for the year 1942, of Imperial Chemical Industries Limited and 96 subsidiary companies....”

“The total gross income shown in the consolidated income statement is £22,182,000, compared with £19,956,000 for 1941. This increase of £2,226,000 is again to be ascribed to the expansion of our activities.

“The net consolidated income for the year has risen from £6,243,000 to £6,873,000, an increase of £630,000, after providing £2,500,000 for the central obsolescence fund, compared with £2,000,000 in the preceding year....”

The “Money Myth”

The letters reprinted below appeared in THE SCOTSMAN following the letter of Major Douglas on this subject which was reprinted in THE SOCIAL CREDITER of May 15:—

Sir,

I do not like to take issue with Major Douglas who has probably done more for monetary reform than any man presently living. He, however, is so satiated with his own orthodoxy that he will not investigate any other. Anyway, it should not be necessary for me to explain that the stable price-level is the relation of all money to all wealth, or the method of assuring that there will always be sufficient purchasing power in existence. It will then be possible to see that any one article or service will always have a proper and just relation to all other articles and services. It is an honest way of equating money to wealth by preventing slumps as there would be no deflation.

We know from experience that fluctuating prices have ruined far more producers than low prices, and if we wish to accomplish anything worth while in the adoption of a better monetary system, I think all reformers should concentrate their efforts on the necessity for regulating money in circulation to suit the people as a whole and not, as at present, to suit financiers. What we have to guard against is finance being in the hands of private vested interests who profit by fluctuating prices. The regulation of money in circulation should therefore be in the hands of an independent Government Authority or we will one day all be debt slaves to international money-lenders.

Yours faithfully,

May 12, 1943.

W. D. CLARK.

Sir,—I am grateful to Mr. Clark for the kindness of his opening sentence in your issue of Saturday, and I accept with, I trust, becoming meekness, his mild rebuke. I have always contended, more in hope than expectation, that I ought to be regarded as orthodox, but I derive the impression that Mr. Clark feels I am rather old-fashioned.

The point I had wished to emphasise is one which, so far from involving a contest of “schemes,” pleads for suspended propaganda for any scheme. My reason is, I think, an important reason. We are, in this money matter, in grave danger of “tipping out the baby with the bath water.”

While commodity-money, gold and silver, was always unsound in principle, it had the immense psychological strength that nearly everyone believed that it was insulated from politics. The “sound money” advocates always realised the weight of this argument, and in this particular, if in no other, they were wholly right.

The fact that it is possible, without derision, to head a letter as this letter is superscribed, is evidence that the effect of arguments that a money system should be used to do this, that, or the other; that it should be a governing system, not a reflecting or accounting system, has been to create the growing impression that a money system is simply a political device, which at the moment is true; and that it cannot be prevented from being a political device; which is not true. If this idea becomes widespread, no money system will work, because no one will work for money.

I am, etc.,

May 17, 1943.

C. H. DOUGLAS.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
 Offices: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,
 LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 10. No. 13.

Saturday, June 5, 1943.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Any one in doubt as to the attitude of Freemasonry, Socialism and Big Business, to Social Credit, should read the notices of the death of Mr. Aberhart in the *Express* newspapers.

There are two excellent letters in the *Scotsman* of May 25, on the Scottish Hydro-Electric Bill, and on Salmon Fishing, which is closely connected with the problem. Readers having access to a file of the *Scotsman*, which is available in most Free Libraries, should read these letters. It is not sufficiently realised that apparently technical and subsidiary subjects go very close to the core of the Big Idea and the Public Ownership racket.

"We execute Masons in such wise that none save the brotherhood can ever have a suspicion of it, not even the victims themselves of our death sentence, they all die when required as if from a normal kind of illness." (Italics in original.) — *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion XV, 9.*

At the beginning of this year, the late William Aberhart broadcast from Edmonton:—

"For three years, a lot of people, myself included, have kept quiet because, mistakenly, we felt that we might hinder Canada's war effort, if we spoke our minds.

"Events have proved the contrary.... Silence on the part of those best informed has begun to sap public morale.... We are going to start a series of broadcasts dealing with the war and post war issues."

The broadcasts were given, and were discussed and applauded all over Canada, and much of the United States.

The uncouth phrase "in the discard" used by the Minister of Health to describe what had happened to his greatly detested plan for the Municipalisation of the Medical Profession has attracted attention. One suggestion is that "it means that these particular cards have been put back into the pack to be dealt out for another game." The Planners, though annoyed by a reverse they did not expect, have not gone out of business, and there is some talk of a more Socialistic Minister of Health. It has already been emphasised here that patients can do as much as their doctors to save themselves from Chain Store

100

Medicine, in league with compulsion rapidly extended to cover the whole of the individual's life.

The Times reports that the Tasmanian Legislative Council, which rejected the Commonwealth Powers Transfer Bill in February, has now agreed by eight votes to six that the Bill be read six months hence, thus shelving it. The Commonwealth Government will review the situation in the light of the votes of the State Parliaments when Dr. Evatt returns from America.

It was announced recently in Alberta that when representatives from the three prairie provinces and farm organisations saw Mr. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, at Ottawa, on the question of farm debt adjustment, Alberta would send Mr. Maynard, Mr. B. MacMillan, Minister of Agriculture, Mr. J. E. Brownlee, K.C., who has been retained by the Government; Mr. A. J. Wilson, of the Alberta Attorney-General's department; and Mr. Tom Church, who would represent farm organisations.

At the conference the resolution passed by the Alberta legislature, originating at the Saskatoon farm debt conference, will be given to Mr. King. A Bill for the consideration of the dominion parliament will also be given to him. The Bill was approved at the Saskatoon conference.

The late Premier of Alberta

The following letter was sent to the *Edinburgh Evening Dispatch*:—

Sir,

In your notice in Monday's issue of the *Evening Dispatch* there are two inaccuracies which I feel sure you would desire to correct.

You refer to the introduction of "Social Credit with the so-called Velocity Dollar." So far from the Velocity Dollar being based on Social Credit principles, it is a direct inversion of them; a particularly vicious form of capital levy. It was imposed on Mr. Aberhart by the Financial Adviser, Mr. R. J. Magor, Chairman of the (federal) Committee on Sound Finance in Government, on whose appointment the Federal Government insisted as a condition of assistance in the catastrophic situation to which "sound Finance" had brought Alberta.

It was not at all doubtful that Mr. Aberhart would have been re-elected in 1940 had there been no war. He was re-elected against a coalition of every other Party with one joint policy—to defeat Social Credit. In spite of corruption on a scale hitherto unknown in Canadian politics, he was re-elected with a substantial majority, and there is nothing in his policy which would not have been equally effective in the growing prosperity which in peace-time he brought to Alberta.

Mr. Aberhart is an historic figure whose importance was becoming recognised all over the American Continent, as well as in Australia and New Zealand. He may easily appear to the historian of fifty years hence as the most considerable Canadian of this era.

Yours, etc.,

May 26, 1943.

C. H. DOUGLAS.

Programme For the Third World War (IX)

By C. H. DOUGLAS

Although British professional, trained, diplomats, like British Generals, are all incompetent, ill-informed, and old-school-tie failures, immeasurably inferior both in intelligence and judgment to the staffs of the *Daily Worker* and its threepenny edition, nevertheless in their unanimity on the German mentality they are supported by so many foreigners that we must reluctantly accept their view. Germans from the time of Frederick the "Great," whether under Monarchies, Republics, or National Socialism, have, as a people, part of them actively, and the rest of them passively, accepted war as the primary national industry.

Now, so-called democracy is definitely pacifist and strongly pro-German, while Socialism both in Russia and Germany is strongly militarist. The pseudo-democracy of Great Britain or the United States views war with weary distaste and is not easily persuaded to retain sufficient armed strength to enable his diplomats to make their voices heard.

I believe that I am stating an ascertained and incontestable fact when I say that Germany, Great Britain and the United States, beyond any other great powers, have been at all significant times dictated to, in matters of policy, by Jews, and predominantly by German Jews. Although, for instance, Lord Vansittart is most careful not to attribute German policy to Jewish control, the point that he makes, which is that there is no change in German policy during the past century; that it has been, and is consistent, amounts to saying that it has always been Jewish, because we know, beyond peradventure, that during the period in which it was most obvious, the period of Bismarck and Wilhelm II, it was moulded and organised by such men as Rathenau, Ballin, Bleichroeder and others, all Jews. It should be observed that there was during this period a facade of violent anti-Judaism in Germany of about the same effective value as that professed by the National Socialist Administration. Practically covering the whole of this period, the German-Jew, Sir Ernest Cassel, was probably the most powerful single individual in Great Britain, and his opposite number and correspondent, Jacob Schiff, the patron of Presidents in America.

If anyone is naive enough to suppose that these people knew nothing of the underlying policy of each other, then I would ask him to consider the fact that the chief financial advisers at the Peace Conference in 1919, representing both the "victors" and the defeated, were all cousins, all Jews, and all connected with one German-Jew bank in New York.

As Premier Stalin said (and we had better take notice), "Hitlers come and Hitlers go, but the German people and the German State remain." He made it clear that he intended them to remain, more or less as they are.

It must surely be obvious that if you have a single effective control over three ostensibly independent nations, and in one of them you exalt militarism to the status of a religion, and in the other two you finance pacifism, together with adulation of the militarist nation (it sounds impossible, but it has been, and is being, done) you cannot conceivably have any primary policy but one. You desire war. Since war in itself is, to put it conservatively, disagreeable, you

obviously do not intend to take part in it, but to use it to further conditions satisfactory to you.

If the Germans are to be credited with elementary intelligence, they must see that nothing could ensure the safety of the Jews so effectively in a European War as a ferocious display of anti-Semitism (I use this misused word advisedly in this instance). It immediately establishes the "persecuted" as non-combatants; it provides a mass of "refugees," many of whom are perfect spies and propagandists, and it puts them in the well-known position of backing every horse in the race. I am completely agnostic as to the extent of genuine barbarity by Germans to Jews. Some of the atrocity stories, such as the use of Jewish babies as footballs, are merely idiotic. But even if I were convinced that it is considerable in extent, my comment would be that it is not a title of the suffering endured by the fighting troops, and is an example of using an army, not without loss, but with a minimum of loss; and the minimum of risk of final defeat. I am convinced that the Jewish High Command desires the ultimate victory of Germany, and will fight tooth-and-nail, *not to end the war*, but to see that Germany is not defeated in the peace.

That, alone, is a sufficient reason for the complete defeat of Germany.

Since Great Britain is, and always has been, the great obstacle to the Big Idea, it is obvious that however much of the fighting is done by her, and however much (and the more the better) her loss and damage, she is to return, like the butler in Barrie's play *The Admirable Crichton*, to that self-effacing hush which is supposed to be becoming to the good. (Anyway, General Eisenheuer won the North African campaign, didn't he!) The Armistice period is incomprehensible other than as a well arranged plan to emasculate and demoralise this country and its people.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. I don't believe that in the consummation of the Great Plan, the Germans would fare very much better than anyone else. But it appears evident that the Germans are the ideal people to do the dirty work antecedent to the coming of the New Jerusalem, and are already "air conditioned" to hand over the reins of power at a suitable moment.

All rights reserved.

To be continued.

'What a Pity'

"From the American Press I quote a story which is being told by Mr. Quentin Reynolds, the well-known journalist and broadcaster. General Dwight (nicknamed 'Ike') Eisenhower, the Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Forces in North Africa, says Mr. Reynolds, likes to relate how his brother Milton, who holds a position in a Department in Washington, squashed a 'snooty' dowager there. This lady is said to have remarked to Mr. Eisenhower: 'What a wonderful family the Eisenhowers are—one brother died at Bataan, one is in charge of an Army, and you have a big job in Washington. You're a great family—what a pity you're Jewish!' Whereat Mr. Eisenhower retorted, 'Madam, what a pity we're not!'"

—*Jewish Chronicle*, April 16, 1943.

Points from Parliament

House of Commons: May 19, 1943.

CIVIL ESTIMATES, 1943: REFUGEE PROBLEM

Sir Richard Acland (Barnstaple): ... I know that this is not solely a Jewish question. It concerns many other races, and many other peoples. But I think that most people will agree that it is a Jewish question in a different degree from the degree in which it is a question of any other race. That difference in degree is so great as to amount to a difference in kind. This is what I want to say to the House; and I wish I had time to develop the argument, which I confess I have only recently become aware of myself. Anti-Semitism, which is a world force, is not simply an attack on the Jews; it is the supreme attack on Christ. That may seem a strange statement, but I believe it to be true. The united powers of world evil dare not attack Christ and Christianity direct, and, in their frustration, they are psychologically distorted, and emerge in this demonic form of anti-Semitism. ... If anti-Semitism is seen as the attack on Christ, it becomes the more terrible that it may be doubted—as it is being doubted—whether this Government care enough.

I will give three reasons which seem to me to prove unmistakably that this Government do not care enough. First, the Government have not appointed one man of outstanding character and given him responsibility, as a full-time job, for putting dynamic energy behind all the things which are being done. The second proof, a small one, I take from one of the so-called concessions that have been announced to-day. A man who is prepared to fight in the Fighting Forces is to be granted a visa provided he is fit. ... If the concession that a man should be willing to fight for the country is to stand, we should wipe out the question of his being physically fit. Take in these men if you can get them whether they are physically fit or not.

The final reason why I say the Government do not care enough is because they have not made the declaration which they could make—that the British Empire, subject to security, of course, will give sanctuary and succour to every Jew who can reach any British frontier or any port where any British ship can call. ... The Government are disappointing the forces of moral decency in this country over this business. There is no doubt about that. The forces of moral decency in this country have only themselves to blame if they are perpetually disregarded because they have organised themselves so ineffectually for political action. I believe they are now beginning to organise themselves more effectively, and those who stand against these forces will not sit on those benches very much longer.

House of Commons: May 25, 1943.

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (INTERIM DEVELOPMENT) BILL

Considered in Committee.

[This Bill was considered in Committee, reported without Amendment, read the third time and passed. All the Amendments proposed were modifications of the technique of planning: none questioned the principle.]

CONCENTRATION OF INDUSTRIES

Mr. Rhys Davies asked the President of the Board of Trade the number of businesses that have been concentrated up to date, stating what are those businesses, the number of firms closed down by this process and the number of nucleus firms left; whether concentration is being pursued further; and, if so, which industries are to be dealt with?

Mr. Dalton: Concentration of production has been applied by my Department to nearly 70 branches of industry. Up to date, 6,156 nucleus certificates have been issued and 3,294 establishments have been closed. The only industries where concentration is now proceeding are the clothing and printing industries.

Mr. Davies: Will my right hon. Friend bear in mind the desirability of not concentrating industries in those parts of the country which suffered severe industrial depression between the two wars and are likely to suffer it again when this war is over?

Mr. Dalton: I think my hon. Friend knows that I am very deeply concerned to see that we do not have, so far as it is within our power to prevent it, any repetition of the state of affairs in pre-war distressed areas. These concentration matters are a war-time provision, and it is laid down in the White Paper issued by my predecessor that the Government will give all facilities for the re-opening at the end of the war of businesses which have been closed down. I will, however, bear in mind what my hon. Friend said.

Mr. Davies: If my right hon. Friend concentrates some of these small businesses out of existence during the war, it does not follow that they will re-open at the end of the war.

NATIONAL FINANCE

GOVERNMENT BORROWING (BANK LOANS)

Mr. Stokes asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that £1,500,000,000 new money has been created by the banks since the commencement of the war until the late autumn of 1942; and whether he is in a position to state what it costs to create this money?

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Sir Kingsley Wood*): I do not agree with the implication in the first part of the Question, nor do I follow the figure there given. I can only refer my hon. Friend to the answer I gave him on May 11, to which I do not think I can usefully add.

Mr. Stokes: Arising out of that most unsatisfactory reply, may I ask my right hon. Friend whether he is aware that the figure given in the Question has been computed by a well-known authority on this subject, and if I put another Question down to my right hon. Friend, will he state specifically what he considers the amount of newly-created money to be?

Sir K. Wood: No, Sir. As I guessed it, the figure had come from Stokes's Encyclopaedia of Phrase and Fable. [*Laughter.*]

THE VOTERS' POLICY as applied to the **Beveridge Report**.—K.R.P. Publications have copies of this Statement by the Bristol Voters' Policy Association for sale at 2d. each.

Mr. Stokes: This is not a laughing matter. Has my right hon. Friend taken the trouble to assess for himself the amount of newly-created bank money since the war started? Does he not think it is one of his duties as Chancellor of the Exchequer to do so?

Sir K. Wood: I have given my hon. Friend an answer.

Mr. Stokes: But that answer was totally unsatisfactory.

House of Commons: May 26, 1943.

STATUTORY RULES AND ORDERS

Major Petherick (Penryn and Falmouth): I beg to move, "That this House, admitting the necessity for war purposes of giving abnormal powers to the Executive, is of opinion that Parliament should vigilantly maintain its ancient right and duty of examining legislation, whether delegated or otherwise."

... I would like to refer for a moment to the immense advantage which we enjoy in this country, and have enjoyed through the ages, of having a Constitution which is largely unwritten. No rigid series of rules such as were laid down by the Medes and Persians and other more modern nations have ever been laid down for us by a body of persons at any given period who thought that their wisdom was eternal and that the circumstances on which they based their code were perennial and would hold good for all time. As a result, we have in our British Constitution a combination of the written and the unwritten, of Statute law and of custom and tradition, together with the ineffable advantage that the King in Parliament can at any given time amend any part of the Constitution.

Thus we have a composite and an ancient edifice which is amorphous though definite, delicate yet powerful, virile yet steadfast—the world's greatest example of a gigantic paradox which works. Evidence of a very merciful lack of rigidity in our Constitution is the overlapping of many points of the judicial, the administrative and the legislative functions, and I fear that this must be a source of abhorrence to logical and tidy minds. But none the less, it has been found to suit in a peculiar fashion the peoples of this Island; and certainly in anything I say to-day there is nothing, I hope, that can be taken to advocate any form of extreme rigidity and certainly not of a written Constitution. But these powers which Parliament has granted have to be watched most carefully. . . .

... I would like to point to the immense growth over the period of the last few years alone of the type of legislation to which I have referred. In 1931 there were 800 statutory Rules, Orders and Regulations; in 1938, while we were still at peace, the number was 1,606, more than double; in 1942 there were 1,697, and this year, so far as we have gone, there are over 700. Nearly all these Rules, Orders and Regulations, or at any rate, a large proportion of them, carry severe penalties which a subject of the King may have to undergo if, unfortunately, out of ignorance alone he infringes them. I know that ignorance is no excuse, no defence, in an action, but, nevertheless, it is alarming when you consider the possibilities of breaking the law in this huge number of Rules, Orders and Regulations on the Statute Book. I very much doubt whether any right hon. or hon. Gentleman adorning the Front Bench could accurately name 5 per cent. of the Orders which were issued

last year, giving the penalties attaching to them and the objects for which they were applied.

There are those who say that this is all the fault of the civil servant, that the Civil Service is an ever-growing self-breeding octopus which is endeavouring to grasp more power for itself in order that it may rule the country over Parliament. I do not think such an accusation is fair; the fault lies here in the House of Commons. The House is not always sufficiently alive to its responsibilities, or sufficiently watchful, in this matter. The Civil Service is a loyal, efficient and industrious machine. But it is a machine, and it has, perhaps, the faults of a machine, namely, that you may have in any given Department a number of officials who know incomparably more than the House of Commons knows on any applied subject, but these officials cannot, and do not, know in the majority of cases what effect what they are doing will have not only on other Departments but on the country as a whole. That the House of Commons does know, from its constitution, knowledge and ever-continuing touch with its constituents all over the country. The civil servant does not see, very often, with all his merits, the whole picture. I admit that some civil servants do grasp for power; it is one of the faults of human nature that the more power you give to a man or institution the more that man and that institution are apt to ask for it.

"L'appétit vient en mangeant."

Hitler started as a house painter. Therefore, it seems to me that the Civil Service must itself be controlled very carefully by the Government and that the House of Commons, as well as the Government, must see that the Civil Service consists of the civil servants and not the civil masters of the nation. I may here point out how difficult it is when we are striving for reform in all these matters to do so successfully when the terminology employed is so obscure, so indistinct and so confused. The same kind of instrument with the same sort of powers may be called an Order in Council, or a Regulation, or a Rule, or a Warrant, or a Special Order, or an Order. Then, of course, there is the whole secondary series of directions, instructions and sub-orders. There is no method and no sense in all this. It seems to me sometimes that a Member of the Government if he wants an Order, may put his hand into a sort of bran pie and pull an Order or a Regulation or an Order in Council out of the bag. Then, too, it is possible to make Regulations under a Statute and to make Orders under the Regulations—these as it were being the grand-children of the Act of Parliament. On top of that, you may have great-grand-children in the form of directions and instructions made under the Order, which is made under the Regulation, which is made under the Act of Parliament. To make things even worse, some of these Orders or Regulations or whatever you may call them need confirmation, some can be annulled by a Prayer in this House, some of them are unchallengeable and some do not come before Parliament at all.

Therefore, I would claim that one immediate reform which ought to be brought into being is to have, as far as possible, a complete standardisation of the nomenclature of all these various instruments. . . .

... Now I come to the really important point which we are advocating to-day, that is, the setting-up of a

Standing Committee consisting of Members of all parties in the House, to examine delegated legislation and report upon it to the House where necessary. In 1931, a Committee under Lord Donoughmore was set up to examine all this wide sphere of delegated legislation. The irreverent suggested that the Committee might well have been called the "Do-no-more Committee," because no action of any kind has been taken from that day to this...

... The Committee would simply see if there was anything in an Order to which they thought any section of the House might reasonably take exception...

... In conclusion, I would say that, even now, while we are in the midst of war, we should carefully and closely watch all this delegated legislation, and when peace-time comes, it behoves us to ask, with a loud and determined voice, the question, "Quo vadis"? We must make sure that the country will not find its last vestiges of liberty being removed or whittled away and that after a long and bloody war our people will not find the shackles forged for them in their own name, so great, so strong, so powerful that they cannot possibly escape from them.

To all Social Credit Groups and Associations, Home and Overseas

Affiliation to the Social Credit Secretariat, which was accorded to Groups of Social Crediters, has been replaced by a new relationship and all previously existing affiliations were terminated as from January 1, 1942. This new relationship is expressed in the following Form which Associations* desiring to act in accordance with the advice of the Secretariat are asked to fill in:—

Name, address, and approximate number of members of Association

.....

We desire to follow the advice of the Social Credit Secretariat†.

To acquaint ourselves with the general character of this advice and the reasons underlying it, we agree to subscribe to *The Social Crediter* regularly in the proportion of at least one copy to every five members.

We agree not to discuss with others, without authorisation, the details of special advice received from the Secretariat.

Date..... Signature.....

A brief statement is also requested giving the history or account of the initiation of the group, and its present activities and intentions.

HEWLETT EDWARDS,
Director of Organisation
and Overseas Relations.

*For this purpose an Association to consist of three or more Social Crediters.

†The Secretariat is the channel used by Major Douglas, the Advisory Chairman, for the transmission of advice.

SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

The following Groups and Associations are registered as working in association with the Social Credit Secretariat:—

GREAT BRITAIN

- ABERDEEN D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., W. J. Sim, 18 Adelphi, Aberdeen.
 - BELFAST D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. A. Crothers, 20 Dromara Street, Belfast.
 - BLACKPOOL D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., A. Davies, 73 Manor Road, Blackpool.
 - BRADFORD D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.
 - CARDIFF D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., Miss H. Pearce, 8 Cwrt-y-vil Road, Penarth, South Wales.
 - LONDON D.S.C. Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.
 - MIDLAND D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. Sanders, 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.
 - NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE and GATESHEAD D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., T. H. Rea, 23 Clarewood Place, Fenham, Newcastle, 5.
 - PORTSMOUTH and SOUTHSEA D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., Mrs. Waite, 50 Ripley Grove, Copnor, Portsmouth.
 - PRESTON D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., B. H. Ferguson, 46 Atherton Road, Fulwood, Preston.
 - SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., C. Daish, 19 Coniston Avenue, Redbridge, Southampton.
 - STOCKTON D.S.C. Group: L. Gilling Smith, Eastrea, Durham Road, Stockton.
- Registered Groups are also working at LEPTON (Yorkshire), WOKING and WOODFORD. Enquiries concerning these should be addressed c/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

AUSTRALIA

- New South Wales** Hon. Secretary.
- NEW SOUTH WALES D.S.C. Assoc.:
WOMEN'S SECTION
DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION OF YOUTH
THE ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN
(The above are closely allied) Miss Grace Marsden.
- INFORMATION SHEET W. H. Hand (Editor).
- COWPER D.S.C. Group J. McDonald.
- South Australia**
- ADELAIDE D.S.C. Group C. H. Allen.
- QUEENSTOWN D.S.C. Group D. J. Munyard.
- GLENELG D.S.C. Group H. W. Lee.
- Western Australia**
- PERTH D.S.C. Group A. Cook.
- Queensland**
- QUEENSLAND D.S.C. Association A. W. Noakes.
- Victoria**
- COBURG S.C. Group A. J. O'Callaghan.

NEW ZEALAND

- PATEA ELECTORATE V.P. Association G. J. Billingham.

SOUTH AFRICA

- PORT ELIZABETH D.S.C. Group L. W. Smith.

CANADA

- VANCOUVER D.S.C. Group Mrs. Brooks.
- LIVERPOOL (Nova Scotia) D.S.C. Group T. E. D. Watson.
- OTTAWA (Parliamentary) D.S.C. Group.